



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

HD

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/647,171

08/22/2003

Dale Kwasniewski

60680-710

1652

26127 7590 05/22/2007  
DYKEMA GOSSETT PLLC  
39577 WOODWARD AVENUE  
SUITE 300  
BLOOMFIELD HILLS, MI 48304-5086

EXAMINER

AIRAPETIAN, MILA

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3625

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

05/22/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/647,171

Applicant(s)

KWASNIEWSKI ET AL.

Examiner

Mila Airapetian

Art Unit

3625

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 January 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-33 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11, 13-33 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 12 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 23 February 2007 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

## Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Drawings*

The drawings were received on 02/23/2007. These drawings are acceptable.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

**Claims 1, 2, 29 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Utsugi et al. (US 2002/0099588) in view of Bury et al. (US 2003/0004768), and further in view of Webb et al. (US 2001/0049644).**

**Claim 1.** Utsugi et al. (hereinafter Utsugi) teaches an order in/out processing system comprising:

a first server configured to generate an application interface on a customer client in communication with said first server through a first network and to receive a first completed application for manufacture of a first part of a vehicle from said customer through said customer client using said application interface ([0125], the use of WAN

suggests accessing Web pages by a client, thereby suggesting client-server architecture), and a third set of information regarding a second part of said vehicle functionally interrelated with said first part of said vehicle ([0135], "sets of parts designated by the orderer to be handled as units").

However, Utsugi does not explicitly teach a set of information defining specifications for said first part.

Bury et al. (hereinafter Bury) teaches a vehicle parts monitoring system including defining specification for the part [0049].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of Utsugi and Bury teachings to include information defining specifications for the part, as disclosed in Bury, because information about the parts specification would allow to quickly cross reference between parts thereby helping the user to accurately access information about authentic parts.

Utsugi also does not explicitly teach that said set of information includes operating conditions of a vehicle.

Webb et al. (Webb) teaches a computer-implemented method for customizing and purchasing vehicle parts wherein the purchaser specifies the main or primary driving condition for the vehicle [0042].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Utsugi to include that said set of information includes

Art Unit: 3625

operating conditions of a vehicle, as disclosed in Webb, because it would advantageously allow to obtain the most appropriate parts for the job.

**Claim 2.** Utsugi teaches said system further comprising: a second server in communication with said first server over one of said first network and a second network; and, a database that stores said information, said database accessible by said second server [0045].

**Claim 29.** Utsugi teaches said system further comprising a manufacturer client in communication with said first server over one of said first network and a second network [0030].

**Claim 30.** Utsugi teaches that said first server transmits an application notification to said manufacturer client upon receipt of said first completed application [0063].

**Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Utsugi, Webb and Williams teachings, as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Giles (US 2005/0138216).**

**Claim 3.** The combination of Utsugi, Webb and Bury teachings teaches all the limitations of claim 3 except said second network comprises an intranet.

Giles teaches a system for affiliate utilization of online trading platform wherein said second network comprises an intranet [0033].

The motivation to combine Utsugi, Webb, Bury and Giles would be to restrict access to unauthorized users through requiring users to provide authentication credentials thereby providing a secure system for the users [0033].

**Claim 10-16 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Utsugi, Webb and Bury teachings, as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Shields et al. (hereinafter Shields) (US 2004/0030614).**

**Claim 10.** The combination of Utsugi, Webb and Bury teachings teaches all the limitations of claim 10 except said application interface includes a plurality of tabs having identifiers, each tab of said plurality of tabs corresponding to a category of requested information from among a plurality of categories of requested information regarding said first part of said vehicle, said plurality of tabs displayed simultaneously by said customer client together with one category of requested information from said plurality of categories of requested information, said one category of requested information selected responsive to a selection of one of said plurality of tabs by said customer through said customer client.

Shields teaches a system for managing workload of procurement buyers including said application interface includes a plurality of tabs having identifiers, each tab of said plurality of tabs corresponding to a category of requested information from among a plurality of categories of requested information regarding said first part of said

Art Unit: 3625

vehicle, said plurality of tabs displayed simultaneously by said customer client together with one category of requested information from said plurality of categories of requested information, said one category of requested information selected responsive to a selection of one of said plurality of tabs by said customer through said customer client [0018].

The motivation to combine Utsugi, Webb, Bury and Shields would be to allow a quick and easy access to the desired information.

**Claim 11.** The combination of Utsugi, Webb and Bury teachings teaches all the limitations of claim 11 except wherein said plurality of tabs are displayed in a plurality of rows, each row of said plurality of rows containing at least two tabs of said plurality of tabs.

Shields teaches a system for managing workload of procurement buyers including plurality of tabs arranged in a row (Fig. 2, [0018], [0020]). Furthermore, while the drawing shows only one row of tabs, the actual amount of rows would be obviously determined by the task.

The motivation to combine Utsugi, Webb, Bury and Shields would be to allow a quick and easy access to the desired information.

**Claim 12.** The combination of Utsugi, Webb and Bury teachings teaches all the limitations of claim 12 except that each category of said plurality of categories of requested information includes at least one field and said first server is further configured to generate a notification to said customer when said customer selects a

new category of requested information and a value in a field of a previously selected category of requested information fails to meet a predetermined condition.

Shields teaches a system for managing workload of procurement buyers including each category of said plurality of categories of requested information includes at least one field and said first server is further configured to generate a notification to said customer when a value in a field of requested information fails to meet a predetermined condition ("*returned for corrections*" [0112]).

The motivation to combine Utsugi, Webb, Bury and Shields would be to provide information that could be helpful for resubmitting the requisition thereby saving the user a considerable time [0115].

**Claim 13.** The combination of Utsugi, Webb and Bury teachings teaches all the limitations of claim 13 except each category of said plurality of categories of requested information includes at least one field and said first server is further configured to generate a first value for a first field responsive to receipt of a second value for a second field from said customer client.

Shields teaches a system for managing workload of procurement buyers including each category of said plurality of categories of requested information includes at least one field and said first server is further configured to generate a first value for a first field responsive to receipt of a second value for a second field from said customer client [0115].



Art Unit: 3625

The motivation to combine Utsugi, Webb, Bury and Shields would be to provide information that could be helpful for resubmitting the requisition thereby saving the user a considerable time [0115].

**Claim 14.** The combination of Utsugi, Webb and Bury teachings teaches all the limitations of claim 14 except said first field and said second field are both in a single category of requested information among said plurality of categories of requested information.

Shields teaches a system for managing workload of procurement buyers including said first field and said second field are both in a single category of requested information among said plurality of categories of requested information [0113].

The motivation to combine Utsugi, Webb, Bury and Shields would be to provide information that could be helpful for resubmitting the requisition thereby saving the user a considerable time [0115].

**Claim 15.** The combination of Utsugi, Webb and Bury teachings teaches all the limitations of claim 15 except said first field and said second field are in different categories of requested information among said plurality of categories of requested information.

Shields teaches a system for managing workload of procurement buyers including said first field and said second field are in different categories of requested information among said plurality of categories of requested information (Fig.2, Fig. 4).

The motivation to combine Utsugi, Webb, Bury and Shields would be to provide information that could be helpful for resubmitting the requisition thereby saving the user a considerable time [0115].

**Claim 16.** The combination of Utsugi, Webb and Bury teachings teaches all the limitations of claim 16 except at least one category of said plurality of categories of requested information includes at least one field and said at least one field includes a menu offering a plurality of possible values for said at least one field.

Shields teaches a system for managing workload of procurement buyers including at least one category of said plurality of categories of requested information includes at least one field and said at least one field includes a menu offering a plurality of possible values for said at least one field (Fig. 3 (26)).

The motivation to combine Utsugi, Webb, Bury and Shields would be to provide a user an easy and quick way to enter values.

**Claim 26.** The combination of Utsugi, Webb and Bury teachings teaches all the limitations of claim 26 except said first server is further configured to transmit an approval notification to said customer upon review of said first completed application by an approval agent of said manufacturer.

Shields teaches a system for managing workload of procurement buyers including first server is further configured to transmit an approval notification to said customer upon review of said first completed application by an approval agent of said manufacturer [0054].

**Claims 17, 18 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Utsugi, Webb and Bury teachings, as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Tanner et al. (US 2004/0243588).**

**Claim 17.** The combination of Utsugi, Webb and Bury teachings teaches all the limitations of claim 17 except said application interface includes an indicator indicating, simultaneously for each of said plurality of categories of requested information, whether said first server has received all requested information in said category of requested information.

Tanner et al. (hereinafter Tanner) teaches a graphical user interface including application interface includes an indicator indicating, simultaneously for each of said plurality of categories of requested information, whether said first server has received all requested information in said category of requested information [0310].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of Utsugi, Webb and Bury to include an indicator indicating, simultaneously for each of said plurality of categories of requested information, whether said first server has received all requested information in said category of requested information, as disclosed in Tanner, because it would advantageously provide a user or operator with the ability to readily recognize, organize, or otherwise group together particular inquiry requests or records based on their respective status condition, as specifically taught by Tanner [0310].

**Claim 18.** The combination of Utsugi, Webb and Bury teachings teaches all the limitations of claim 18 except said indicator displays one of two colors for each of said plurality of categories of requested information.

Tanner teaches a graphical user interface wherein said indicator displays one of two colors for each of said plurality of categories of requested information [0310].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of Utsugi, Webb and Bury to include that said indicator displays one of two colors for each of said plurality of categories of requested information, as disclosed in Tanner, because it would advantageously provide a user or operator with the ability to readily recognize, organize, or otherwise group together particular inquiry requests or records based on their respective status condition, as specifically taught by Tanner [0310].

**Claim 19.** The combination of Utsugi, Webb and Bury teachings teaches all the limitations of claim 19 except said indicator includes a plurality of members corresponding to said plurality of tabs, said plurality of members ordered in the same manner as said plurality of tabs.

Tanner teaches a graphical user interface including indicator includes a plurality of members corresponding to said plurality of tabs, said plurality of members ordered in the same manner as said plurality of tabs [0310].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of Utsugi, Webb and Bury to include a

Art Unit: 3625

plurality of members corresponding to said plurality of tabs, said plurality of members ordered in the same manner as said plurality of tabs, as disclosed in Tanner, because it would advantageously provide a user or operator with the ability to readily recognize, organize, or otherwise group together particular inquiry requests or records based on their respective status condition, as specifically taught by Tanner [0310].

**Claims 21-25, 31-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Utsugi, Webb and Bury teachings, as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Olson et al. (hereinafter Olson) (US 2003/0004825).**

**Claim 21.** The combination of Utsugi, Webb and Bury teachings teaches all the limitations of claim 21 except said first server is further configured to transmit to said customer client, responsive to a request received from said customer client, an electronic link to a prior application of said customer.

Olson teaches a system for processing requests for parts and material including first server is further configured to transmit to said customer client, responsive to a request received from said customer client, an electronic link to a prior application of said customer [0070].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of Utsugi, Webb and Bury to include said first server is further configured to transmit to said customer client, responsive to a

request received from said customer client, an electronic link to a prior application of said customer, as disclosed in Olson, because it would advantageously allow the user to select from any projects associated with that user to use the previously entered project information, eliminating the time required to enter the information over again, as specifically taught by Olson [0070].

**Claim 22.** The combination of Utsugi, Webb and Bury teachings teaches all the limitations of claim 22 except said prior application comprises a second completed application.

Olson teaches a system for processing requests for parts and material including said prior application comprises a second completed application [0070].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of Utsugi, Webb and Bury to include that said prior application comprises a second completed application, as disclosed in Olson, because it would advantageously allow the user to select from any projects associated with that user to use the previously entered project information, eliminating the time required to enter the information over again, as specifically taught by Olson [0070].

**Claim 23.** The combination of Utsugi, Webb and Bury teachings teaches all the limitations of claim 23 except said prior application comprises an incomplete application.

Olson teaches a system for processing requests for parts and material including said prior application comprises an incomplete application [0067].

Art Unit: 3625

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of Utsugi, Webb and Bury to include that said prior application comprises an incomplete application, as disclosed in Olson, because it would advantageously allow to come back and complete the application at a convenient for the customer time.

**Claim 24.** The combination of Utsugi, Webb and Bury teachings teaches all the limitations of claim 24 except said first server is further configured, responsive to a request received from said customer client, to create a new application by copying said prior application.

Olson teaches a system for processing requests for parts and material including said first server is further configured, responsive to a request received from said customer client, to create a new application by copying said prior application [0070].

The motivation to combine Utsugi, Webb, Bury and Olson would be to eliminate the time required to enter the information over again [0070].

**Claim 25.** The combination of Utsugi, Webb and Bury teachings teaches all the limitations of claim 25 except said first server is further configured to transmit to said customer client, responsive to a request received from said customer client, electronic links to prior applications of said customer and to order said electronic links in accordance with one of a plurality of criteria selected by said customer through said customer client.

Olson teaches a system for processing requests for parts and material including said first server is further configured to transmit to said customer client, responsive to a request received from said customer client, electronic links to prior applications of said customer and to order said electronic links in accordance with one of a plurality of criteria selected by said customer through said customer client [0080].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of Utsugi, Webb and Bury to include links to prior applications of said customer and to order said electronic links in accordance with one of a plurality of criteria selected by said customer through said customer client, as disclosed in Olson, because it would advantageously allow the user to select from any projects associated with that user to use the previously entered project information, eliminating the time required to enter the information over again, as specifically taught by Olson [0070].

**Claim 31.** The combination of Utsugi, Webb and Bury teachings teaches all the limitations of claim 31 except said application notification includes an electronic link to said first completed application.

Olson teaches a system for processing requests for parts and material including said application notification includes an electronic link to said first completed application [0061], [0067].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of Utsugi, Webb and Bury to include that



Art Unit: 3625

application notification includes an electronic link to said first completed application, as disclosed in Olson, because it would advantageously allow the user to select from any projects associated with that user to use the previously entered project information, eliminating the time required to enter the information over again, as specifically taught by Olson [0070].

**Claim 32.** The combination of Utsugi, Webb and Bury teachings teaches all the limitations of claim 32 except said first server is further configured to transmit to said manufacturer client first and second electronic links to said first completed application and a second completed application, respectively, each of said first and second completed applications associated with an approval agent.

Olson teaches a system for processing requests for parts and material including said first server is further configured to transmit to said manufacturer client first and second electronic links to said first completed application and a second completed application, respectively, each of said first and second completed applications associated with an approval agent [0080].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of Utsugi, Webb and Bury to include that said first server is further configured to transmit to said manufacturer client first and second electronic links to said first completed application and a second completed application, respectively, each of said first and second completed applications associated with an approval agent, as disclosed in Olson, because it would

Art Unit: 3625

advantageously allow the user to select from any projects associated with that user to use the previously entered project information, eliminating the time required to enter the information over again, as specifically taught by Olson [0070].

**Claim 33.** The combination of Utsugi, Webb and Bury teachings teaches all the limitations of claim 33 except said first server is further configured to order said first and second electronic links in accordance with one of a plurality of criteria selected by said approval agent through said manufacturer client.

Olson teaches a system for processing requests for parts and material including said first server is further configured to order said first and second electronic links in accordance with one of a plurality of criteria selected by said approval agent through said manufacturer client [0080].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of Utsugi, Webb and Bury to include said first and second electronic links in accordance with one of a plurality of criteria selected by said approval agent through said manufacturer client, as disclosed in Olson, because it would advantageously allow the user to select from any projects associated with that user to use the previously entered project information, eliminating the time required to enter the information over again, as specifically taught by Olson [0070].

**Claim 27 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Utsugi, Webb, Bury and Shields teachings, as applied to claim 26 above, and further in view of Olson.**

**Claim 27.** The combination of Utsugi, Webb, Bury and Shields teachings teaches all the limitations of claim 27 except said approval notification includes an electronic link to said first completed application.

Olson teaches a system for processing requests for parts and material including said approval notification includes an electronic link to said first completed application [0080].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of Utsugi, Webb and Bury to include said approval notification includes an electronic link to said first completed application, as disclosed in Olson, because it would advantageously allow the user to select from any projects associated with that user to use the previously entered project information, eliminating the time required to enter the information over again, as specifically taught by Olson [0070].

**Claim 28.** The combination of Utsugi, Webb, Bury and Shields teachings teaches all the limitations of claim 28 except said first server is further configured to transmit to said customer client, responsive to a request received from said customer client, electronic links to a subset of prior applications of said customer, said subset created responsive to search data provided by said customer.

Olson teaches a system for processing requests for parts and material including said first server is further configured to transmit to said customer client, responsive to a request received from said customer client, electronic links to a subset of prior applications of said customer, said subset created responsive to search data provided by said customer [0080].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of Utsugi, Webb and Bury to include that said first server is further configured to transmit to said customer client, responsive to a request received from said customer client, electronic links to a subset of prior applications of said customer, said subset created responsive to search data provided by said customer, as disclosed in Olson, because it would advantageously allow the user to select from any projects associated with that user to use the previously entered project information, eliminating the time required to enter the information over again, as specifically taught by Olson [0070].

**Claims 8 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Utsugi, Webb and Bury teachings, as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Brickell et al. (US 2003/0115142).**

**Claim 8.** The combination of Utsugi, Bury and Webb teachings teaches all the limitations of claim 8 except said first server is further configured to authenticate first

and second forms of identification for said customer received from said customer client and that said first form of identification corresponds to said second form of identification.

Brickell et al. (hereinafter Brickell) teaches identity authentication portfolio system wherein said first server is further configured to authenticate first and second forms of identification for said customer received from said customer client and that said first form of identification corresponds to said second form of identification [0035].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of Utsugi, Bury and Webb to include that the server is further configured to authenticate first and second forms of identification for said customer received from said customer client and that said first form of identification corresponds to said second form of identification, as disclosed in Brickell, because it would advantageously allow to authenticate users in real time wherever they are and with whatever authentication devices are currently available to them, as specifically taught by Brickell [0006].

**Claim 9.** The combination of Utsugi, Webb and Bury teachings teaches all the limitations of claim 9 except said first server is further configured to transmit said second form of identification corresponding to said first form of identification to a predetermined location designated by said customer upon receipt of said first form of identification from said customer through said customer client.

Brickell teaches identity authentication portfolio system wherein said first server is further configured to transmit said second form of identification corresponding to said

Art Unit: 3625

first form of identification to a predetermined location designated by said customer upon receipt of said first form of identification from said customer through said customer client [0035].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of Utsugi, Bury and Webb to include that a server is further configured to transmit said second form of identification corresponding to said first form of identification to a predetermined location designated by said customer upon receipt of said first form of identification from said customer through said customer client, as disclosed in Brickell, because it would advantageously allow to authenticate users in real time wherever they are and with whatever authentication devices are currently available to them, as specifically taught by Brickell [0006].

**Claims 4, 5 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Utsugi, Bury and Webb in view of Schuyler et al. (US 6,832,202).**

**Claim 4.** The combination of Utsugi, Bury and Webb teaches all the limitations of claim 4 except that a data structure that associates said first completed application with an approval agent, said first server further configured to access said data structure and transmit an application notification to said approval agent upon receipt of said completed application.

Schuyler teaches a system of routing requests for authorized approval including determining a valid agent to provide one of the approvals required for authorization of the request and notifying the user who initiated the application that the request has been approved (col. 1, lines 47-55; col. 10, lines 20-28).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of Utsugi, Bury and Webb to include an approval agent, as disclosed in Schuyler, because it would advantageously allow to improve the movement of work by automating manual tasks, as specifically taught by Schuyler (col. 1, lines 44-45).

**Claim 5.** The combination of Utsugi, Bury and Webb teachings teaches all the limitations of claim 5 except said data structure associates said application with said approval agent based on an identity of said customer.

Schuyler teaches a system of routing requests for authorized approval including determining a valid agent to provide one of the approvals required for authorization of the request and notifying the user who initiated the application that the request has been approved (col. 6, lines 20-21).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of Utsugi, Bury and Webb to include an approval agent, as disclosed in Schuyler, because it would advantageously allow to improve the movement of work by automating manual tasks, as specifically taught by Schuyler (col. 1, lines 44-45).

**Claim 7.** The combination of Utsugi, Bury and Webb teaches all the limitations of claim 4 except that transmitting an approval notification to said customer client if said information in said first completed application meets predetermined conditions and to transmit an application notification to an approval agent if said information in said first completed application does not meet said predetermined condition.

Schuyler) teaches a system of routing requests for authorized approval including determining a valid agent to provide one of the approvals required for authorization of the request and notifying the user who initiated the application that the request has been approved (col. 10, lines 20-28).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of Utsugi, Bury and Webb to include an approval agent, as disclosed in Schuyler, because it would advantageously allow to improve the movement of work by automating manual tasks, as specifically taught by Schuyler (col. 1, lines 44-45).

**Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Utsugi, Bury, Webb and Schuyler, as applied to claim 4, in view of Haines et al. (US 2002/0072998).**

**Claim 6.** The combination of Utsugi, Bury, Webb and Schuyler teaches all the limitations of claim 6 that notification includes an electronic link to said first completed application.



Haines et al. (hereinafter Haines) teaches an e-commerce system wherein the e-mail contains a link (or URL) to a web site that is configurable to work with an internal customer ordering system [0089].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of Utsugi, Bury, Webb and Schuyler, to include that notification includes an electronic link to said first completed application, as disclosed in Haines, because it would advantageously simplify an access to the desired information, thereby providing convenience to the customer.

**Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Utsugi, Bury and Webb, as applied to claim 1, and further in view of Reichwein.**

**Claim 20.** The combination of Utsugi, Bury and Webb teaches all the limitations of claim 20 except that said vehicle part is one of a steer axle, a drive axle, a trailer axle and a brake.

Reichwein further teaches said system wherein said vehicle part is one of a steer axle, a drive axle, a trailer axle and a brake [0087].

The motivation to combine Utsugi, Bury, Webb and Reichwein would be to obtain information without the need for the presence of a representative of the repair shop, as specifically taught by Reichwein [0022].

***Allowable Subject Matter***

Claim 12 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

***Response to Arguments***

In response to Applicant's argument that the prior art does not teach client-server architecture, it is noted that the use of WAN suggests accessing Web pages by a client, thereby suggesting client-server architecture.

In response to Applicant's argument that the prior art does not teach "third set of information regarding a second part of said vehicle functionally interrelated with said first part of said vehicle, it is noted that Utsugi teaches said feature. Specifically, Utsugi teaches ordering sets of parts which all are indispensable for assembling them, sets of parts designated by the orderer to be handled as units [0135].

In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, Utsugi and Bury are related to purchasing parts over the Internet. Bury was applied to disclose: defining

Art Unit: 3625

specifications for the first part. The motivation to combine would be to quickly cross reference between parts thereby helping the user to accurately access information about authentic parts.

In response to Applicant's argument that Shields does not disclose plurality of rows, each row containing plurality of tabs, it is noted that Shields teaches a system for managing workload of procurement buyers including plurality of tabs arranged in a row (Fig. 2, [0018], [0020]). While the drawing shows only one row of tabs, the actual amount of rows would be obviously determined by the task.

In response to Applicant's argument that Shields does not teach placing the order, it is noted that Shields explicitly teaches procurement system, wherein purchasing parts indicates placing and order for said purchasing [0019].

In response to Applicant's argument that Shields does not teach generating a notification, it is noted that Shields was applied to show generating a notification to said customer when a value in a field of requested information fails to meet a predetermined condition ("*returned for corrections*" [0112]).

The remaining argument are moot in view of new grounds of rejections.

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mila Airapetian whose telephone number is (571) 272-3202. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 9:30 am - 6:00 pm.

Art Unit: 3625

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jeffrey A. Smith can be reached on (571) 272-6763. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

MA

  
JEFFREY A. SMITH  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600